Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-14, presently pending in this application now stand Finally Rejected. To place this application in better condition, applicants request they be allowed to amend claims 1, 11, 11, and 13 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.116(b). Ample antecedent basis exists in the specification for the claim amendments.

Before proceeding to address the examiner's rejections, applicants will briefly summarize their invention to assist the examiner in better appreciating the differences between applicants' invention and the art of record. As recited in amended claim 1, applicants provide a method for producing a show in a production environment having at least one processing unit in communications with a plurality of production devices. The method commences upon the receipt of a show rundown comprising a plurality of story files. The show rundown undergoes conversion into broadcast instructions that, when executed, enable the transmission of commands to control a plurality of production devices to thereby produce the show. The plurality of production devices includes a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device.

35 U.S.C. 102(e) Rejection of Claims 1, 11, and 13

Claims 1, 11, and 13 stand Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,084,581, issued July 4, 2000, from an application filed May 6, 1997, in the name of Gregory Hunt. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The Hunt patent describes an automated video recording system comprised of a video server, which provides selected video files to one or more video recording devices in response to commands from a computer. Each recording device can thus record a customized video product based on the files provided by the video server.

In rejecting applicants' claims 1, 11, and 13, the examiner contends that the Hunt patent converts a show rundown (program selection choices) into commands broadcast instructions that control one or more production devices, such as video recorders. In that regard, the examiner contends that a video tape recorder inherently constitutes a graphic device.

The examiner's assertion that the video recording devices of Hunt inherently constitute graphic devices has absolutely no foundation. At paragraph [0061] at pages 19 and 20 of their

specification, applicants describe the plurality of elements used to produce a show as including:

> "...video switching with a defined transition effect; audio mixing; camera controls (such as pan, tilt, zoom and focus); external machine controls, via communication protocols (such as a play, search and stop command for video tape recorders (VTR)s, video servers/virtual recorders (VR)s, digital video devices (DVD)s, and digital audio tape (DAT) and cassette equipment); teleprompting system controls; graphics controls (such as digital video effects (DVE) and character generators and/or still stores)

Applicants separate recitation of videotape recorders and graphic control devices reflects recognition that these devices constitute separate and unique television production devices. The "graphics device" recited in claims 1, 11, and 13 corresponds to the character generator/still store described in applicants' specification.

To better distinguish their invention, applicants have amended claims 1, 11, and 13 to recite that the plurality of production devices includes a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device. The Hunt patent does not disclose sending commands to a graphics device comprised of a character generator/still store, let alone sending commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device. At best, Hunt transmits commands only to a group of video tape recorders, not to any other type of production device, nor to a plurality of such devices as recited in claims 1, 11, and 13. Therefore, amended claims 1, 11, and 13 patentably distinguish over the Hunt patent, and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of these claims.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claim 2

Claim 2 stands Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Hunt patent, in view of U.S. Patent 6,141,007, issued October 31, 2000, from an application filed April 4, 1997, in the name of P. David Lebling et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the amendment to claim 1.

Applicants have discussed the Hunt patent in connection with the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claim 1 and will not repeat that discussion here for the sake of brevity. For purposes of the instant rejection, applicants reiterate that Hunt does not transmit commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device.

The Lebling et al. patent concerns a user interface that enables the display of different classes of information on different screens in connection with a news automation system. The Lebling et al. user interface affords a user the ability to scroll information.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and further recites the feature of receiving a story file and transmitting at least one command to a teleprompter to display the script during show production. With regard to this claim, the examiner notes that the Hunt patent discloses all of the features of claim 1, but does not disclose a script mode. The examiner relies on the Lebling patent for teaching a script mode suitable for displaying text, and thus contends it would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to combine the Hunt and Lebling et al. patents to teach all of the features of applicants' claim 2.

As discussed above, the Hunt patents does not transmit commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device, as recited in claim 1 and incorporated by reference in claim 2. The Lebling et al. patent also fails to teach this feature. Therefore, in the absence any teaching of transmitting commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device, in either of the Hunt or Leibling et al. patents, the examiner's proposed combination of these patents would not teach all of the features of applicants' claim 2. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 2.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claims 3-6, 8-12 and 14

Claims 3-6, 8-12 and 14 stand Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Hunt patent, in view of U.S. Patent 6,437,802, issued August 20, 2002 from an application filed July 14, 1999, in the name of Kevin Kenny. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have discussed the Hunt patent and will not repeat that discussion here for the sake of brevity. For purposes of the instant rejection, applicants reiterate that Hunt does not transmit commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device.

The Kenny patent concerts a technique for throttling commands in a broadcast automation system by interleaving play list loads and edit commands. In this way, devices within the system can receive an incomplete schedule, which the devices can immediately

execute. As later events undergo processing, the devices can execute such events as they become processed.

Claims 3, 12, and 14 depend from claims 1, 11, and 13, respectively, and recite the additional feature of monitoring for inter-file activity and synchronizing the show rundown with the broadcast instructions. In rejecting claims 3, 12 and 14, the examiner contends that the Hunt patent discloses all of the features of claims 1, 11, and 13, but does not teach monitoring and synchronizing of inter-file activity. The examiner relies on the Kenny patent to teach the monitoring of inter-file activity and the synchronization of the show rundown with the broadcast instructions.

Applicants take issue with the examiner's rejection for several reasons. First, the examiner's reliance on the Kenny patent as teaching the **synchronization** of the show rundown with the broadcast instructions lacks merit. Applicants acknowledge the disclosure in the Kenny patent at Col. 4, lines 6-7 concerning the monitoring of incoming commands. However, this cited portion of Kenny relied upon by the examiner makes no mention of synchronization. Indeed, nowhere does Kenny use the word synchronization. In the absence of any teaching in either the Hunt or the Kenny patents regarding synchronization of the show rundown with the broadcast instructions, the examiner's proposed combination of these patents would not render obvious claims 3, 12, and 14.

Assuming arguendo that the Kenny patent does teach synchronization, the combination of Kenny and Hunt would still not render obvious applicants' claims 3, 12 and 14. Applicants' claims 3, 12 and 14, depend from claims 1, 11, and 13, respectively, and incorporate by reference the feature of controlling a plurality of production devices that include a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, a graphics device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device. As discussed above, the Hunt patent does not control a such a plurality of production devices. While the Kenny patent depicts controlling a set of audio and video devices, the patent contains no disclosure concerning the specific nature of these devices. Thus Kenny would not disclose or suggest controlling a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, a graphics device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device. Therefore, the combination of the Hunt and Kenny patents would not teach all of the features incorporated by reference in claims 3, 12, and 14 and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of these claims is thus requested.

Claims 4-6 and 8 further depend from claim 3 and thus patentably distinguish over the art of record for the same reasons as advanced above for the allowability of claim 3.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 4-6 and 8.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claim 7

Claim 7 stands Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Hunt patent, in view of Kenny, further in view of U.S. Patent 6,441,832, issued August 27, 2002, from an application filed November 26, 1997, in the name of Akihiko Tao et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have discussed both the Hunt and Kenny patents, and will not repeat that discussion. For purpose of the present rejection, applicants reiterate that the combination of Hunt and Kenny do not teach or suggest the feature of controlling a plurality of production devices that include a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, a graphics device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device. Further, the combination of Hunt and Kenny does not teach or suggest synchronizing the show rundown with the broadcast instructions.

The Tao et al. patent teaches a hierarchical processing apparatus for video and audio for editing a play list. A display device displays the first and second play list hierarchies to allow interaction between the play lists.

Applicants' claim 7 depends from claim 3 and further includes the feature of adjusting un-executed broadcast instructions such that the total execution time does not exceed a predetermined time. In rejecting claim 7, the examiner contends that the Hunt and Kenny patents teach all of the features of claim 7, except the feature of adjusting the broadcast instructions. For that teaching, the examiner relies on the Tao et al. patent. The examiner maintains that the browse feature of Tao et al., which outputs a selected play list for a predetermined time, constitutes the same feature as recited in claim 7.

Applicants take issue with the examiner's rejection of claim 7 for several reasons. First, the combination of Hunt and Kenny does not teach synchronizing the show rundown with the broadcast instructions. Since the examiner has not cited Tao for such a teaching, the combination of Hunt, Kenny and Tao would not teach the synchronization of the show rundown with the broadcast instructions recited in claim 3, and incorporated by reference in claim 7.

Assuming arguendo that Hunt and Kenny teach the synchronization of the show rundown with the broadcast instructions, applicants maintain that the Tao et al. patent does

not teach or suggest applicants' feature of adjusting the unexecuted broadcast instructions such that the total execution time does not exceed a predetermined time. At best, Tao et al. teach the desirability of enabling a user to output a play list for a selected time. However, the Tao et al. patent contains no disclosure about making any modifications or adjustments to the play list so that the unexecuted portions will execute in a reduced time such that the total execution time does not exceed a predetermined time. Absent any disclosure that executing the browse function of Tao et al. will reduce the execution time of the un-executed the play list, the Tao et al. patent, when combined with Hunt and Kenny, would not teach all the features recited in applicants' claim 7. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of this claim.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claim 9

Claim 9 stands Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Hunt patent, in view of the Tao et al. patent. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and further recites the feature of associating broadcast element files with each story file to link a group of production devices to each story file. As discussed previously, the Hunt patent fails to teach or suggest the feature of transmitting commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, a graphics device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device. Likewise, the Tao et al. patent also fails to teach this feature. Since the combination of the Hunt and Tao et al. patents fail to teach all of the features of claim 1, the claim 9, which incorporates by reference the features of claim 1, patentably distinguishes over the art of record, and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection of Claim 10

Claim 10 stands Finally Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the Hunt patent, in view of the Tao et al. patent, further in view of U.S. Patent 6,204,840, issued March 20, 2001, from an application filed April 8, 1998, in the name of Ihor Petelycky et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have discussed the Hunt and Tao et al. patents and will not repeat that discussion here. For purposes of this rejection, applicants reiterate that neither Hunt nor Tao et al. teach the feature of transmitting commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt

head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device, as recited in claim 1 and incorporated by reference in claim 10.

The Petelyckyet al. patent concerns a multimedia composition method a memory stores digital images of interest. Objects representative of the images appear as icons on a display screen to allow selection and manipulation of the images into a story line.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and incorporates the feature of populating an instruction sheet with icons. The icons when activated, execute corresponding broadcast instructions that control the plurality of production devices. In rejecting claim 10, the examiner contends that the Hunt and Tao et al. patents, in combination, teach all of the features of claim 9, and that the Petelycky et al. patent represents media objects as icons.

Applicants' take issue with the rejection of claim 10 for several reasons. First, claim 10 ultimately depends from claim 1 and incorporates by reference the feature of transmitting commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device. None of the Hunt, Tao et al. or Petelycky et al. patents alone, or in any combination with each other, discloses or suggests such a feature. In the absence of any disclosure of the feature of transmitting commands to a plurality of a camera, a robotic pan/tilt head, an audio mixer device, teleprompting means, and a special effects device in art of record, claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the art of record.

Further, none of the references, and especially the Petelycky et al. patent discloses the feature of populating a broadcast instruction time sheet with icons, corresponding broadcast instructions, which when executed, cause the transmission of commands to control the plurality of production devices, as now recited in claim 10. At best, the Petelycky et al. patent discloses the desirability of representing media objects as icons to enable drag and drop editing. However, the Petelycky et al. patent contains no disclosure whatsoever that selecting one of the media objects triggers the operation of a plurality of production devices, as recited in claim 10. Accordingly, claim 10 patentably distinguishes over the art of record, and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of that claim.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicants respectfully solicit entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the rejection. If, however, the Examiner is believes that

such action cannot be taken, the examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange for a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,
Alex Holtz et al.

By: Robert B. Levy
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
2 Independence Boulevard - Suite 2
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
September 24, 2004